



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

A

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/928,577	08/13/2001	Travis J. Parry	10007333-1	7880
7590	10/03/2005		EXAMINER	
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration P.O. Box 272400 Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400			HAILU, TADESSE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2173	

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/928,577	PARRY, TRAVIS J.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tadesse Hailu	2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 June 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15 and 21-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-15 and 21-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/22/05.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the Amendment submitted/entered with filing of RCE on June 28, 2005 for the patent application number 09/928,577.
2. The information disclosure statement submitted on Feb 22, 2005 has been considered and entered into the File.
3. The pending claims 1-15, and 21-25 are examined herein as follows:

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

*(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.*

4. Claims 1-15, 21-22, and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood et al (US Pat No 6,453,127) in view of Roosen et al (US Pub. No. 2002/0036793).

With regard to claim 1:

As illustrated in Fig. 4, Wood discloses a basic user interface display page for a printer 15 (see Fig. 1). Again, as shown in Fig. 4, there are sets of parameters that can be customized by an operator/user (column 3, lines 22-32).

Wood also discloses a web browser 20 of remote workstation 11 or a web browser 31 of workstation 30 initiates a request to web server 32 of to send via HTTP connection 18 a displayed web page to web browser 20, which may includes one or more

Wood also discloses initiating a remote request (from workstation 11, Fig. 1) over said network (Internet 21, Fig. 1) for a web page (via web browser 20) from said web server (web server 32, Fig. 2), said web page associated with at least one software application (e.g., java applet 21), Fig. 2), said at least one software application configured (set up) to provide customizable control panel functionality for controlling operations of said printing device (column 3, lines 24-63, Fig. 4, column 5, lines 3-53; column 6, lines 66-column 7, lines 20).

Wood also discloses transmitting said web page over said network (column 4, lines 34-52; column 6, lines 66-column 7, lines 20; Fig. 2).

Wood also discloses downloading and displaying said web page using said web browser (Abstract, column 6, lines 1-10).

Wood also discloses downloading said at least one software application using said web browser in response to downloading said web page (Abstract, column 2, lines 67-column 3, lines 8; column 10, lines 46-55), and

Wood further discloses customizing a printer control panel using said at least one software application (column 3, lines 24-63, Fig. 4). Wood further describes that said software application (e.g., supervisory application, Java applet 21) which resides at the user machine may be used in changing the configuration of the control panel functionality and control of operations of said printing device (column 2, lines 49-65, column 3, lines 24-63, Fig. 4, column 4, lines 8-33, column 5, lines 3-53; column 6, lines 66-column 7, lines 20).

Furthermore, while Wood describes the web server residing at computer 30 (column 2, lines 49-65), but Wood does not disclose, "a web server incorporated in a printing device and linked to said network," as required by claim 1. However, Roosen discloses several

implementations of a web-enabled features similar to current invention, in which Roosen describes that the web server need not be resident at each workstations (Roosen, Fig. 2B), Rather, the web server may be built (or incorporated) into each printer (Roosen, Fig. 2C, paragraph 111).

Roosen and Wood are from analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, that is, web-enabled remote printer control. Although the web server is not placed within the printing device in Wood, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to place the web server within the printing device as described by Roosen because this implementation (i.e., placing web server at the printing device) is suitable for environments containing only one or more or a small number of printers (see Roosen, paragraph 111).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Roosen and Wood to obtain the invention as specified in claim1.

With regard to claim 2:

Wood further discloses providing a library of selectable printing features by said at least one software application (column 3, lines 22-31, column 6, lines 66-column 7, lines 8). For example, as illustrated in Fig. 4, a library of selectable printing features are shown, such features includes side imaged, collate, and paper, image quality, and so forth. Wood further discloses additional display options for selection of print job information features or templates (column 3, lines 14-65).

With regard to claim 3:

Wood further discloses that the customizing comprises selecting at least one printing feature from said library of selectable printing features (column 3, lines 22-31). For example, as illustrated in operator interface screen, i.e., operator control/panel of Fig. 4, one or more of the printing features or job information features or templates are selectable by the operator (column 3, lines 14-65).

With regard to claim 4:

Wood further discloses that each of said printing features (column 3, lines 54-65) of said library of selectable printing is associated with an identifier (column 3, lines 14-65), and wherein said selecting comprises selecting said at least one printing feature on the basis of said identifier (column 3, lines 22-31; lines 54-65).

With regard to claim 5:

Wood further discloses providing a workstation configured with said web browser (column 4, lines 49-52). As illustrated in Fig. 2, workstation 11 configured with said web browser 20, and workstation 30 configured with web browser 31 (Fig. 2).

With regard to claim 6:

Wood further discloses storing said at least one printing feature (column 6, lines 41-54).

With regard to claim 7:

Wood further discloses that said storing comprises storing said at least one printing feature in a memory component of said printing device 15 in job image buffer 24 (Fig. 2, column 6, lines 41-54; column 6, lines 66-column 7, lines 20).

With regard to claim 8:

Wood further discloses that the customizing a previously stored printer control panel, said previously stored printer control panel accessed from said memory component of said printing device or said workstation. For example, user can access/open a saved job and customizes the saved control/panel (column 3, lines 40-43; column 6, lines 22-34).

With regard to claim 9:

Wood further discloses accessing said previously stored printer control panel using at least one of a PIN or a password (column 6, lines 3-18).

With regard to claim 10:

Wood further discloses arranging said at least one printing feature in a user-determined configuration prior to said storing (column 3, lines 40-43).

With regard to claim 11:

Wood further discloses arranging said at least one printing feature on a graphical user interface displayed within said web browser (column 5, lines 3-35).

With regard to claim 12:

Wood further discloses that said web browser comprises a java-enabled Web browser (column 1, lines 46-59; column 4, lines 53-66).

With regard to claim 13:

Wood further discloses executing said at least software application using a Java Virtual Machine platform on said workstation (column 4, lines 53-66; column 6, lines 6-15).

With regard to claim 14:

Wood further discloses that said initiating said remote request over said network comprises initiating said remote request over the Internet (column 2, lines 49-column 3, lines 32; column 4, lines 34-52, and Figs. 1 and 2).

With regard to claim 15:

Wood discloses a system (Fig. 1) for customizing a printer control panel (column 3, lines 24-63, Fig. 4).

Wood also discloses at least one workstation (e.g., Workstation 11, Figs 1 or 2) configured for communicating (via http connection 18, Fig. 2) with said network Internet 21), said at least one workstation (Workstation 11) having a web browser (web browser 20, Fig. 2) thereon.

Wood further discloses at least one software application (Java applet 21, Fig. 2) transmissible by said web server (32) and accessible by said web browser (20), said at least one software application (java applet 21) configured to provide customizable control panel functionality for said printing device through user input on said at least one workstation (column 2, lines 49-65; column 3, lines 54-65; column 4, lines 8-33; column 5, lines 3-24).

Wood further describes that said software application (e.g., Java applet 21) which resides at the user machine may be used in changing the configuration of the control panel functionality and control of operations of said printing device (column 3, lines 24-63, Fig. 4, column 5, lines 3-53; column 6, lines 66-column 7, lines 20).

Furthermore, while Wood describes the web server residing at computer 30 (column 2, lines 49-65), but Wood does not disclose "a printing device incorporating a web server, said web server linked to a network," and linked to said network" as required by claim 1. However,

Roosen discloses several implementations of a web-enabled features similar to current invention, in which Roosen describes that the web server need not be resident at each workstations (Roosen, Fig. 2B), Rather, the web server may be built (or incorporated) into each printer (Roosen, Fig. 2C, paragraph 111).

Roosen and Wood are from analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, that is, web-enabled remote printer control. Although the web server is not placed within the printing device in Wood, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to place the web server within the printing device as described by Roosen because this implementation (i.e., placing web server at the printing device) is suitable for environments containing only one or more or a small number of printers (see Roosen, paragraph 111).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Roosen and Wood to obtain the invention as specified in claim 15.

With regard to claim 21:

Independent claim 21 corresponds generally to independent claim 1 and recites similar features. In addition to claim 1, claim 21 further recites at least one other network device. Wood in view of Roosen discloses a plurality of network devices at least including one other printer, e.g., printer 15, 15', or 15'') (Wood, Fig. 1).

With regard to claim 22:

Wood in view of Roosen discloses that said at least one other network device comprises a printing device, e.g., printer 15, 15', or 15'') (Wood, Fig. 1).

With regard to claim 24:

Wood in view of Roosen further discloses that said at least one software application configured to provide customizable control panel functionality comprises identifying the availability and status of said at least one network device (Wood, column 3, lines 66-column 4, lines 7, column 5, lines 25-35).

With regard to claim 25:

Wood in view of Roosen further discloses that said at least one software application configured to provide customizable control panel (e.g., Fig. 4) functionality comprises providing links to the at least one other network device (Wood, column 3, lines 24-63, Fig. 4).

5. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood et al (US Pat No 6,453,127) in view of Roosen et al (US Pub. No. 2002/0036793) as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Jackson (US Pub No. 2002/0131072).

While Wood in view of Roosen discloses that said web server incorporated in a printing device may communicate with said at least one other network device (Wood, e.g., other printer 15', or 15'', Fig. 2) in a client/server arrangement or architecture. But Wood in view of Roosen does not describe said architecture as a peer-to-peer network as required in claim 23. However, Jackson discloses a peer-to-peer architecture. Jackson further discloses web server communicating with other device in a peer-to-peer relationship (Jackson, paragraph 39).

Wood, Roosen and Jackson are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, controlling a networked device, e.g., printing device.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use peer-to-peer architecture of Jackson in place of Wood in view of Roosen because as

suggested in Jackson one using peer-to-peer architecture will be benefit than other arrangement architecture (Jackson, paragraph 39).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wood, Roosen with Jackson to obtain the invention as specified in claim 23.

***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed Feb 22, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding presently amended independent claim 1, the Applicant argue that Wood in view of Roosen does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1 to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 regarding the claimed invention. In contrast to the Applicant's argument, the Examiner has established a *prima facie* case of obviousness regarding the claimed invention. First, The suggestion /motivation for doing so (i.e., to place the web server within the printing device as described by Roosen) would have been suitable for environments containing only one or more or a small number of printers (see Roosen, Fig. 2C, paragraph 111). Thus web server that is built into the printer will be able to inform the browser of the status of its own printer and of print jobs residing in that printer. this arrangement is especially suitable for environments containing only one or a small number of printers. Second, the examiner at the time this invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to produce a web server incorporated in a printing device and linked to a network using the method of the prior art with a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the nature of the problem to be solved in both the prior art and the invention is similar. The combined prior art device (i.e., network printer) is capable of being modified to run the way the apparatus (printing device) is claimed, and there is a suggestion or motivation in the reference

to do so (see, Roosen paragraph 111). Thus, the Examiner has established the *prima facie* case of obviousness.

The Applicant also argues Wood does not teach or suggest “customizing a printer control panel.” In contrast to the Applicant’s argument Wood teaches “customizing a printer control panel.” Some of the configuration options used to customize the printer settings within the graphical user interface shown in Fig. 4, for example, includes (but not limited to) sides to be imaged, collate selections, paper supply options, image quality (darker-lighten) selections, reduction/enlargement selections, finisher selections, and quantity requested.” (Column 3, lines 55 through 58). These typical configuration options of a printer read on the language of claim 1.

The Applicant also argues “customizing a printer control panel using said at least one software application- said software application available as desired to at least one user to change the configuration of the control panel functionality and control of operations of said printing device.” In contrast to the Applicant’s argument, Wood describes at least one software application (e.g., supervisory application 34, java applet 21, etc) configured to provide customizable control panel functionality (Wood, column 2, lines 49-65, column 3, lines 54-65, column 4, lines 8-33, column 5, lines 3-24).

Accordingly, the argument presented by the Applicant, in regard to claims 1-15 and 21-25 are not persuasive because Wood in view of Roosen teaches the claimed invention including, among other things, printer control panel (e.g., Fig. 4), “customizing a printer control panel,”(e.g., column 3, lines 54-65) and “customizing a printer control panel using said at least one software application,..” (e.g., column 2, lines 49-65, etc).

Having fully addressed the applicant’s arguments, the rejection still stands.

## CONCLUSION

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Tadesse Hailu, whose telephone number is (571) 272-4051. The Examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 10:30 – 7:00 ET. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca, can be reached at (571) 272-4048 Art Unit 2173.
8. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Patent Examiner

Tadesse Hailu

9/21/05

